



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,031	09/23/2003	Masaya Okita	Soyu C-6B	1821

23474 7590 12/11/2007
FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.
2026 RAMBLING ROAD
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/669,031	Applicant(s) OKITA, MASAYA	
	Examiner Jeff Piziali	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2007 & 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,10,15 and 20-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,10,15 and 20-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/115,018.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/115,018, filed on 14 July 1998.

Oath/Declaration

2. The 'Response' submitted 12 December 2005 amends paragraph [0001] of the instant specification to state that the instant application is a continuation-in-part of Application No. 09/801,098. A supplemental oath or declaration is required under 37 CFR 1.67. The new oath or declaration must properly identify the application of which it is to form a part, preferably by application number and filing date in the body of the oath or declaration. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Art Unit: 2629

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a liquid crystal display device comprising a nematic liquid crystal" (at lines 2-3) and "a matrix liquid crystal panel using a nematic liquid crystal" (at lines 5-6).

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared nematic liquid crystal; or rather refer to two distinct and independent nematic liquid crystals.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a first voltage corresponding to image data" (at line 7) and "a second voltage that does not correspond to image data" (at lines 10-11).

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared piece of image data; or rather refer to two distinct and independent pieces of image data.

6. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Art Unit: 2629

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a first voltage corresponding to image data" (at line 7) and "a second voltage that does not correspond to image data" (at lines 10-11).

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared piece of image data; or rather refer to two distinct and independent pieces of image data.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 22 recites the limitation "the first time zone" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a liquid crystal display device that includes a nematic liquid crystal" (at lines 2-3) and "a matrix liquid crystal panel using a nematic liquid crystal" (at lines 5-6).

Art Unit: 2629

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared nematic liquid crystal; or rather refer to two distinct and independent nematic liquid crystals.

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a first absolute voltage corresponding to image data" (at lines 8-9) and "a second absolute voltage not corresponding to image data" (at lines 11-12).

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared piece of image data; or rather refer to two distinct and independent pieces of image data.

11. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a nematic liquid crystal in a liquid crystal display device" (at lines 1-2) and "a matrix liquid crystal panel using a nematic liquid crystal" (at lines 5-6).

Art Unit: 2629

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared nematic liquid crystal; or rather refer to two distinct and independent nematic liquid crystals.

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a first absolute voltage corresponding to image data" (at line 7) and "a second absolute voltage that does not correspond to image data" (at lines 10-11).

It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the aforementioned limitations refer to a single shared piece of image data; or rather refer to two distinct and independent pieces of image data.

13. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 15, and 21, 24, 25, and 27-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 2629

15. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 15, and 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by the applicant's own admission of prior art (see Figs. 2 & 3; Paragraphs 2-11; Paragraphs 19-20; Paragraphs 26-28; and Paragraphs 33-35 -- wherein Fig. 2 refers to the illustration as originally submitted in Application No. 09/801,098, aka US Patent Application Publication US 2001/0052885 A1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 15, and 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (US 5,594,464) in view of Molsen et al (US 6,122,024 A). Note that claim order has been rearranged below to better reflect claim dependencies.

Regarding claim 20, Tanaka discloses a method for driving a nematic liquid crystal in liquid crystal display device comprising a nematic liquid crystal (see the Abstract), two electrodes [Fig. 28; C & S] sandwiching the nematic liquid crystal (see Column 21, Lines 10-41), two polarizing plates sandwiching the two electrodes (see Column 10, Lines 19-22) and a matrix liquid crystal panel [Fig. 4; 11] using a nematic liquid crystal (see Column 11, Line 45 - Column 12, Line 15), consisting of the steps of: applying a first voltage [Fig. 2, 202] corresponding to image data to the liquid crystal during a first time period [i.e. one signal period] in a unit period [Fig.2; t'1, t0, t1]; and applying a second voltage [Fig.2; 201] that does not correspond to image

Art Unit: 2629

data to the liquid crystal during a second time period [Fig.2; t_1 - (one signal period), t_0 - (one signal period), t_1 - (one signal period)] in the unit period, wherein the unit period consists of the first time period and the second time period, and the optical transmittance [Fig. 2; 204] of the nematic liquid crystal changes from an initial level corresponding to the second voltage to a level corresponding to image data during the first time period and changes from the level corresponding to image data to the initial level corresponding to the second voltage during the second time period (see Column 10, Lines 26-67), and the matrix liquid crystal panel is an active matrix liquid crystal panel (see Column 1, Lines 25-30).

Even if arguably Tanaka were shown to teach an active matrix liquid crystal panel with sufficient specificity; Molsen does teach an active matrix liquid crystal panel (see Column 6, Lines 35-48).

Tanaka and Molsen are analogous art, because they are from the shared inventive field of driving nematic liquid crystal display devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Molsen's active matrix non-chiral nematic liquid crystal panel as Tanaka's liquid crystal panel, so as to readily optimize low operating voltages and high birefringence and provide fast switching speed (see Molsen: Column 3, Lines 53-56).

Regarding claim 3, Tanaka discloses the second voltage applied in the second time period of the unit period erases an image on the panel during the second time period (see Fig. 2; Column 10, Lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 4, Tanaka discloses erasure of the image displayed on the panel is effected by driving the liquid crystal to display black on the panel (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 7, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4; furthermore, Tanaka discloses the second voltage is zero volts (see Fig. 2; Column 10, Lines 52-59).

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4; furthermore, Tanaka discloses the voltage applied in the second time period of the unit period erases an image on the panel by darkening the TFT liquid crystal panel to substantially black during the second time period (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 15, Tanaka does not expressly disclose the unit period is less than or equal to 8 milliseconds (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 52-59). However, the examiner takes official notice that it was commonly known and understood in art at the time of invention to set such a unit period to 8 milliseconds or less. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to set Tanaka's unit period to less than or equal to 8 milliseconds, so as to provide quick enough response times such that display viewing is made comfortable for users.

Regarding claim 21, Tanaka discloses the liquid crystal display device is a TFT liquid crystal display device (see Column 1, Lines 10-41).

Regarding claim 22, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 20; furthermore, Tanaka discloses an image display method for a liquid crystal display device including a matrix liquid crystal panel using a nematic liquid crystal, consisting of the steps of: applying a first absolute voltage [Fig. 2, 202] corresponding to image data to the liquid crystal during a first time period [i.e. one signal period] a unit period [Fig.2; t_1 , t_0 , t_1]; and applying second absolute voltage [Fig.2; 201] having a predetermined potential and that does not correspond to image data to the liquid crystal in a second time zone [Fig.2; t_1 - (one signal period), t_0 - (one signal period), t_1 - (one signal period)] different from the first time zone in the unit period (see Column 10, Lines 26-67), and wherein the matrix liquid crystal panel is an active matrix liquid crystal panel (see Column 1, Lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 23, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claims 20 and 22 (see Column 10, Lines 26-67).

Regarding claim 24, Tanaka discloses the first absolute voltage consists of a first positive voltage and a first negative voltage and the sum of the first positive voltage and the first negative voltage in the unit period is zero volts (see Fig. 2; Column 10, Lines 26-67).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 25, Tanaka discloses the level corresponding to the second voltage is white or black (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 26, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claims 20, 22, and 24.

Regarding claim 27, Tanaka discloses the second absolute voltage applied in the second time period of the unit period erases an image on the panel during the second time period (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 28, Tanaka discloses erasure of the image displayed on the panel is effected by driving the liquid crystal to display black on the panel (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 29, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4; furthermore, Tanaka discloses the liquid crystal display device is normally black and the second absolute voltage is zero volts (see Fig. 2; Column 10, Lines 52-59).

Regarding claim 30, Tanaka discloses the liquid crystal display device is a TFT liquid crystal display device including a plurality of pixels (see Column 1, Lines 10-41).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 31, Tanaka discloses the level corresponding to the second absolute voltage is white or black (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 35-38).

Regarding claim 32, Tanaka discloses the nematic liquid crystal is a twisted nematic liquid crystal (see Column 24, Line 50).

Regarding claim 33, Tanaka discloses the nematic liquid crystal is a twisted nematic liquid crystal (see Column 24, Line 50).

Regarding claim 34, Tanaka discloses the nematic liquid crystal is a twisted nematic liquid crystal (see Column 24, Line 50).

Regarding claim 35, Tanaka discloses the nematic liquid crystal is a twisted nematic liquid crystal (see Column 24, Line 50).

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 29 May 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant contends support for claim 17's subject matter of the second time period having a greater duration than the first time period, "can be found in Figure 1 of the present application in which the first time period in which 'V1' and '-V1' is less than the time period in

Art Unit: 2629

which '0V' is applied" (see the last paragraph on page 8 of the Amendment filed 12 December 2005). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Nowhere in the written disclosure are the two time period durations ever explicitly compared. None of the provided illustrations (including Figure 1) are ever acknowledged as being drawn to scale. Furthermore, Figure 1 neglects to anywhere visually distinguish a "first time period duration" from a "second time period duration." Due to all these commingling factors, one having ordinary skill in the art would have no reasonable way of necessarily deducing that the instant invention is limited to the second time period having a greater duration than the first time period, as claimed.

The applicant next contends, "Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15, and 20-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the applicant's own admission of prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection and urges that Figures 2 and 3 erroneously submitted as prior art cannot be used as prior art against claims because the erroneously submitted Figures are also the Applicant's own work" (see Page 8 of the Response filed 29 May 2007).

The applicant further contends, "One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand that Figure 2 in application Serial No. 09/801,098 is a duplicate of Figure 1 and was submitted in error since there is no disclosure in this application which supports Figure 2 as being 'prior art'"

Art Unit: 2629

(see the second paragraph on page 10 of the Amendment filed 12 December 2005). However, again the examiner must respectfully disagree.

Figure 2 is clearly labeled as "Prior Art" in Serial No. 09/801,098 (as well as Patent Application Publication US 2001/0052885 A1, published 20 December 2001). While the applicant may argue now in retrospect that the illustrated waveforms of Figure 2 were submitted in error; such arguments are going to hold little sway over anyone else skilled in the art, who upon seeing published Figure 2 labeled as "Prior Art" is going to naturally and immediately assume such a "Prior Art" label is accurate. If Figure 2 was indeed erroneously submitted as prior art, the examiner can appreciate the Applicant's dilemma of now sculpting distinguishing claim language. However, the examiner cannot simply ignore that fact that Figure 2 was published, and is on the official patent record as constituting "Prior Art."

The applicants contend, "Claims 20, 22-23, and 26 require the steps of applying a first voltage corresponding to image data to the liquid crystal during a first time period and applying a second voltage that does not corresponding to image data to the liquid crystal during a second time period. Tanaka discloses, in Figure 2, the applied scan electrode waveform 201, the applied signal electrode waveform 202, and the resulting composite waveform 203 upon concurrent application of waveforms 201 and 202, and Tanaka also discloses a voltage pulse applied such as $(V1+V2)$ in $t03$ or $V1$ in $t13$. Tanaka, however, does not disclose the two-step application of the voltage, consisting of 1) applying voltages corresponding to image data, and then 2) applying voltage not corresponding to image data. Tanaka discloses the voltage that is a concurrent

Art Unit: 2629

application of two voltages, rather than two-step application of two voltages. Further, Tanaka does not disclose the voltage corresponding to image data and the voltage not corresponding to image data" (see Pages 9-10 of the Response filed 29 May 2007). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Tanaka discloses applying a first voltage [Fig. 2, 202] corresponding to image data to the liquid crystal during a first time period [i.e. one signal period] in a unit period [Fig.2; t'1, t0, t1]; and applying a second voltage [Fig.2; 201] that does not correspond to image data to the liquid crystal during a second time period [Fig.2; t'1 - (one signal period), t0 - (one signal period), t1 - (one signal period)] in the unit period, wherein the unit period consists of the first time period and the second time period (see Column 10, Lines 26-67).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a "two-step application of two voltage" that is not "concurrent") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The applicants contend, "Tanaka discloses the matrix driving method, but Tanaka does not disclose the matrix liquid crystal panel or the active matrix crystal panel included in the liquid crystal display device. Accordingly, Claims 20, 22-23, and 26 are believed to be

Art Unit: 2629

patentably distinguishable over Tanaka and Molsen, alone or in combination with one another" (see Pages 10-11 of the Response filed 29 May 2007). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Tanaka discloses an active matrix liquid crystal panel (see Column 1, Lines 25-30). Even if arguably Tanaka were shown to teach an active matrix liquid crystal panel with sufficient specificity; Molsen does teach an active matrix liquid crystal panel (see Column 6, Lines 35-48).

Tanaka and Molsen are analogous art, because they are from the shared inventive field of driving nematic liquid crystal display devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Molsen's active matrix non-chiral nematic liquid crystal panel as Tanaka's liquid crystal panel, so as to readily optimize low operating voltages and high birefringence and provide fast switching speed (see Molsen: Column 3, Lines 53-56).

The applicants contend, "Claim 15 recites 'the unit period is less than or equal to eight milliseconds,' but Tanaka discloses in column 22, line 2-3, that scanning of the entire screen was performed in one cycle every 60 seconds.' The unit period of eight milliseconds is different by more than ten thousand times. Therefore, it is not obvious to set Tanaka's unit period to less than or equal to eight milliseconds" (see Page 11 of the Response filed 29 May 2007). However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Art Unit: 2629

Tanaka does not expressly disclose the unit period is less than or equal to 8 milliseconds (see Figure 2; Column 10, Lines 52-59). However, the examiner takes official notice that it was commonly known and understood in art at the time of invention to set such a unit period to 8 milliseconds or less. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to set Tanaka's unit period to less than or equal to 8 milliseconds, so as to provide quick enough response times such that display viewing is made comfortable for users.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 15, and 20-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph ground(s) of rejection.

By such reasoning rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2629

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jeff Piziali
7 December 2007